APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,158	05/23/2002	Craig Abruzzo	6208-007US	8191

27383   7590   06/25/2008
CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP
31 WEST 52ND STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10019-6131

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 February 2008</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2.29.08</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 29 February 2008.

2.   Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1, 3-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Porter (US 6473892, filed 31 December 1998), in view of Ferrel et al. (US

5860073, filed 17 July 1995, hereafter Ferrel), and in further view of Smith et al. (US

6052693, filed 2 July 1996, hereafter Smith), and in further view of Tozzoli et al. (US

6151588, filed 9 February 1998, hereafter Tozzoli).

In regard to independent claim 1, Porter discloses an object-oriented system for

assembling a document (Porter Abstract), the system comprising; a plurality of terms

(Porter Col 5 Lines 21-25 i.e. words); a plurality of objects (Porter Col 7 Lines 19-27),

and at least one of said plurality of objects including at least one of said plurality of

terms (Porter Col 5 Lines 21-25 i.e. words); at least one of said conditions including at

least one of said plurality of terms or a value of an object tag; and wherein the

instruction comprises an action to be taken to assemble the document; and; wherein,

when the condition of one of said plurality of grammar lines is true, then said instruction

associated with said condition is executed thereby assembling at least a portion of said

document by insertion of the object body. (Porter Col 5 Lines 21-25 i.e. words) (Porter

Abstract)

Porter does not mention each of said plurality of objects including an object tag

and an object body. However, Ferrel mentions the story objects themselves having

formatting tags (Ferrel Col 19 Lines 44-51). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of including

object tags to identify a portion of the content and displaying the content as taught by

Ferrel Col 3 Lines 32-38.

Porter does not mention a plurality of grammar lines, each of said plurality of

grammar lines including a condition and an instruction and all instructions needed for

crating the document are contained in the grammar lines; when the condition of one of

said plurality of grammar lines is true. However, Smith mentions a set of grammar rules

and word lists (Smith Col 16 Lines 33-37). Smith also mentions a return of True if

certain conditions are met (Smith Col 10 Lines 38-40). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of

having grammar rules so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted

string and can be divided into tokens as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

Porter does not mention a transaction file comprising a plurality of terms

comprising data descriptive of one or more financial transactions performed by a trading

system. However, Tozzoli mentions a trading system that is used for financial

transactions (Tozzoli Col 4 Lines 53 through Col 7Line 65). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Tozzoli to Porter, providing Porter the benefit

of having a financial trading systems, which would assist a user in trading strategies.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Porter discloses wherein at least one of said

plurality of objects includes the object body comprises a fixed text portion. (Porter Col 1

Lines 19-21)

In regard to dependent claim 4, Porter does not mention wherein at least one of

said plurality of objects includes the object body comprises a visual image. However,

Ferrel mentions wherein an object can be an image (Ferrel Col 7 Lines 60-62).). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to Porter,

providing Porter the benefit of having an object the is an images for the benefit of having

several object to choose from rather than text as taught by Ferrel Col 7 Lines 60-62.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Porter does not mention wherein said at least one instruction includes at least one of said object tags and executing said instruction includes inserting said object body associated with said at least one of said object tags into said document. However, Ferrel mentions the story objects themselves having formatting tags (Ferrel Col 19 Lines 44-51 and Col 31 Lines 7-11 i.e. styles corresponding to tags and inserted into the control). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of including object tags to identify a portion of the content and displaying the content as taught by Ferrel Col 3 Lines 32-38 and to inserting into the control so the system begins recurring up through node to node wherein it determines that more children exist as taught by Ferrel Col 31 Lines 7-21.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Porter does not mention wherein each of said plurality of grammar lines includes a grammar tag, said instruction includes at least one of said grammar tags and executing said instruction includes testing said condition associated with each of said plurality of grammar lines having said at least one of said grammar tags, and executing said instruction associated with said condition associated with one of said plurality of grammar lines having said at least one of said grammar tags if said condition is true.

However, Smith mentions a set of grammar rules and word lists (Smith Col 16 Lines 33-37). Smith also mentions a return of True if certain conditions are met (Smith Col 10 Lines 38-40). Smith also mentions a Test condition that is performed (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply

Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Porter does not mention wherein each of said plurality of grammar lines includes a grammar tag and at least two of said plurality of grammar lines have identical grammar tags. However, Smith mentions a tag research hit that is identical (Smith Col 31 Lines 62-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of identical tags for a different option for research hits for unification as taught by Col 31 Lines 38-67 and Col 32 Lines 1-5.

In regard to dependent claim 8, Porter does not specifically mention wherein said conditions of said at least two of said plurality of grammar lines are mutually exclusive. However, Smith mentions mutually exclusive values (Smith Col 14 Lines 63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having mutually exclusive values important to the data entry step which involves taking a source document and placing it into an electronic document source as taught by Smith Col 14 Lines 48-67.

In regard to dependent claim 9, Porter discloses said instruction associated with said one of said at least two of said plurality of grammar lines including said default tag is executed.(Porter Abstract compiled and executed)

Porter does not mention wherein one of said at least two of said plurality of grammar lines includes a default tag. However, Ferrel mentions the story objects

themselves having formatting tags (Ferrel Col 19 Lines 44-51 and Col 31 Lines 7-11 i.e.

styles corresponding to tags and inserted into the control and Col 42 Lines 49 i.e.

default). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to

Porter, providing Porter the benefit of including object tags to identify a portion of the

content and displaying the content as taught by Ferrel Col 3 Lines 32-38 and to

inserting into the control so the system begins recurring up through node to node

wherein it determines that more children exist as taught by Ferrel Col 31 Lines 7-21.

Porter does not mention said condition of said one of said at least two of said

plurality of grammar lines is always true or if said conditions of said remaining of said at

least two of said plurality of grammar lines are not true. However, Smith mentions a set

of grammar rules and word lists (Smith Col 16 Lines 33-37). Smith also mentions a

return of true or False if certain conditions are met (Smith Col 10 Lines 38-40 and Col

14 Lines 14-15). Smith also mentions a Test condition that is performed (Smith Col 10

Lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply

Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that have

several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens and

tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

Porter does not specifically mention wherein said conditions of said at least two

of said plurality of grammar lines are mutually exclusive. However, Smith mentions

mutually exclusive values (Smith Col 14 Lines 63). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having

mutually exclusive values important to the data entry step which involves taking a

source document and placing it into an electronic document source as taught by Smith

Col 14 Lines 48-67.

In regard to dependent claim 10, claim 10 reflects similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale

In regard to dependent claim 11, Porter discloses assembly of the document

begins by executing said instruction .(Porter Abstract compiled and executed)

Porter does not mention where the portion being executed is a plurality of

grammar lines. However, Smith mentions a set of grammar rules and word lists (Smith

Col 16 Lines 33-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the

apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that

have several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens

and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

Porter does not mention where the grammar lines includes a <start> grammar

tag. However, Ferrel mentions a process that begins with a start state (Ferrel Col 16

Lines 30-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply

Ferrel to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having a start tag or state so that there is

a definite beginning the document publishing process as taught by Ferrel Col 16 Lines

30-37.

In regard to dependent claim 12, Porter discloses wherein the document is

assembled when said instruction associated with one of said portion of said plurality of

grammar lines is executed.(Porter Abstract compiled and executed)

Porter does not mention where the portion being executed is a plurality of

grammar lines. However, Smith mentions a set of grammar rules and word lists (Smith

Col 16 Lines 33-37).. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the

apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that

have several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens

and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

In regard to independent claim 13, claim 13 in addition to the following reflects

similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Further, Smith discloses testing said condition of one of said plurality of grammar lines

and executing said instruction associated with said condition if said condition is true.

(Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43) (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of

having grammar rules so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted

string and can be divided into tokens and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Porter discloses wherein at least one of said

plurality of objects includes a fixed text portion.(Porter Col 1 Lines 19-21)

Porter does not mention wherein said at least one instruction includes at least

one of said object tags and executing said instruction.. However, Ferrel mentions the

story objects themselves having formatting tags (Ferrel Col 19 Lines 44-51 and Col 31

Lines 7-11 i.e. styles corresponding to tags and inserted into the control). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to Porter, providing

Porter the benefit of including object tags to identify a portion of the content and

displaying the content as taught by Ferrel Col 3 Lines 32-38 and to inserting into the

control so the system begins recurring up through node to node wherein it determines

that more children exist as taught by Ferrel Col 31 Lines 7-21.

Porter does not mention inserting into said document said at least one of said

plurality of objects including a fixed text portion associated with said at least one of said

object tags. However, Ferrel mentions the story objects themselves having formatting

tags (Ferrel Col 19 Lines 44-51 and Col 31 Lines 7-11 i.e. styles corresponding to tags

and inserted into the control). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art the apply Ferrel to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of including object tags to

identify a portion of the content and displaying the content as taught by Ferrel Col 3

Lines 32-38 and to inserting into the control so the system begins recurring up through

node to node wherein it determines that more children exist as taught by Ferrel Col 31

Lines 7-21.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Porter discloses, testing said condition of each

of said plurality of grammar lines having said at least one of said grammar tags; and

executing said instruction associated with said condition associated with said at least

one of said grammar tags if said condition is true.

Porter does not mention wherein each of said plurality of grammar lines includes

a grammar tag, said instruction includes at least one of said grammar tags.. However,

Ferrel mentions the story objects themselves having formatting tags (Ferrel Col 19

Lines 44-51 and Col 31 Lines 7-11 i.e. styles corresponding to tags and inserted into the

control). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to

Porter, providing Porter the benefit of including object tags to identify a portion of the

content and displaying the content as taught by Ferrel Col 3 Lines 32-38 and to

inserting into the control so the system begins recurring up through node to node

wherein it determines that more children exist as taught by Ferrel Col 31 Lines 7-21.

Smith mentions testing said condition of one of said plurality of grammar lines

and executing said instruction associated with said condition if said condition is true

(Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43) (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of

having grammar rules so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted

string and can be divided into tokens and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

In regard to dependent claim 16, claim 16 reflects similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale

In regard to dependent claim 17, claim 17 reflects similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 8 and is rejected along the same rationale

In regard to dependent claim 18, Claim 18 in addition to the following reflects

similar subject matter claimed in claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.

testing said condition of one of said plurality of grammar lines and executing said

instruction associated with said condition if said condition is true (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-

43) (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules

so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided

into tokens and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

Porter does not mention default tag if said condition of each of said remaining of said at least two of said plurality of grammar lines is not true. However, Smith mentions a set of grammar rules and word lists (Smith Col 16 Lines 33-37). Smith also mentions a return of true or False if certain conditions are met (Smith Col 10 Lines 38-40 and Col 14 Lines 14-15). Smith also mentions a Test condition that is performed (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

In regard to dependent claim 19, Porter does not mention where the portion being executed is a plurality of grammar lines. However, Smith mentions a set of grammar rules and word lists (Smith Col 16 Lines 33-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that have several words can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens and tested as taught by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

Porter does not mention where the grammar lines includes a <start> grammar tag. However, Ferrel mentions a process that begins with a start state (Ferrel Col 16 Lines 30-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Ferrel to Porter, providing Porter the benefit of having a start tag or state so that there is a definite beginning the document publishing process as taught by Ferrel Col 16 Lines 30-37.

Porter does not mention grammar lines with a condition of true. However, Smith

mentions a set of grammar rules and word lists (Smith Col 16 Lines 33-37). Smith also

mentions a return of True if certain conditions are met (Smith Col 10 Lines 38-40).

Smith also mentions a Test condition that is performed (Smith Col 10 Lines 41-43). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Smith to Porter,

providing Porter the benefit of having grammar rules so text that have several words

can appear in a single quoted string and can be divided into tokens and tested as taught

by Smith Col 19 Lines 12-18.

In regard to dependent claim 20, claim 20 reflects similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 12 and is rejected along the same rationale

6.   Claims 2 and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Porter, Ferrel, Smith, Tozzoli, and in further view of Atkins (US 5875437, filed 15

April 1997).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Porter does not mention wherein at least one of

said plurality of terms includes an economic term associated with a financial transaction

and said document is a confirmation of said transaction.. However, Atkins mentions a

word processor function (which uses words and terms) for a financial transaction for a

SmartWallet or SmartPurse (Atkins Col 60 Lines 26-43). Also Atkins mentions a

financial function to verify and confirm transactions (Atkins Col 60 Lines 13-16). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the apply Atkins to Porter,

providing Porter the benefit of having a word processor application the use economic

terms to section functions such as application database functions and financial

functions to verify transactions as taught by Atkins Col 60 Lines 12- 17 and 26-43.

In regard to dependent claim 21, claim 21 reflects similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 29 February 2008 have been considered but they are

not persuasive.

The applicant's initial argument is based upon the belief that Porter fails to

disclose an object as claimed (page 9). This is based upon Porter failing to disclose the

object comprising an object tag (page 9). While the examiner recognizes that Porter

fails to disclose the object comprising an object tag, Porter teaches objects (column 7,

lines 19-27). Based upon the failure of Porter to disclose tagging of this object data, the

examiner includes the Ferrel reference. Ferrel discloses tagging of object data (column

3, lines 7-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

combine Ferrel's tagging of object data with Porter's use of object data, thereby allowing

for identification of object data (Ferrel: column 3, lines 32-38).

The applicant further argues that neither Ferrel nor Porter provide a suggestion

of how to functionally integrate Ferrel into Porter. However, the test for obviousness is

not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the

structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly

suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined

teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). As the examiner stated

above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ferrel's

tagging of object data with Porter's use of object data, thereby allowing for identification

of object data (Ferrel: column 3, lines 32-38).

The applicant argues that the prior art of record fails to disclose terms (page 10).

As an initial matter, the applicant's claim states, "wherein the value of, at least one of

said conditions is true based upon the data comprising **at least one of** said plurality of

terms **or** a value of an object tag (claim 1, lines 11-12; emphasis added)." Therefore,

the claim does not require a term to be disclosed. Instead, either a term or a value of

an object tag may be taught. In this instance, Porter discloses values (words) of an

object (column 5, lines 21-25). However, the examiner has added the Tozzoli reference

for the disclosure of financial terms (column 4, line 53- column 7, line 65). Therefore,

this argument is not persuasive.

Further, the applicant argues that Tozzoli and Porter are non-analogous art

(page 11). The examiner respectfully disagrees. As the applicant points out, "a

reference in a field different from that of the applicant's endeavor may be reasonably

pertinent if it is one which, because of the matter from which it deals, logically would

have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his or her invention as a

whole (MPEP 2441.01(a))." Tozzoli discloses the use of financial transactions while

Porter discloses the use of objects. One attempting to create financial objects would

have recognized Porter's use of objects and Tozzoli's use of financial terms are related

to solving the proposed problem. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the two.

The applicant further argues that the examiner's reasons for combining the

references are different than those of the applicant (page 13). However, the fact that

applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following

the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences

would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. &

Inter. 1985).

The applicant arguments presented on pages 12-24 are substantially similar to

those presented on pages 8-14. These arguments are not persuasive for the reasons

above.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork   /Stephen S. Hong/
Examiner   Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Art Unit 2178   Unit 2178

krs